

REMARKS

Office has required restriction in the present application as follows:

Group I, Claims 1, 2 and 13-18 drawn to aziridine compositions.

Group II, Claims 19-27 drawn to methods of making aziridine compositions.

Group III, Claims 28-32 drawn to methods of treating leather and leather compositions and

Group IV, Claim 29 drawn to methods of curing coated surfaces.

Applicants elect with traverse Group I, Claims 1, 2 and 13-18 drawn to aziridine compositions.

The Examiner has categorized inventions II and I as process of making and product made and in the instant case the aziridine compositions can be made by processes other than those identified in Group II. Furthermore inventions I and III, IV are categorized as product and process of use and in the instant application the aziridine compositions have applications in curing processes other than curing leathers, coating surfaces and textile printing.

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement on the grounds that no adequate reasons and/or examples have been provided to support a conclusion of patentable distinctness between the identified groups or shown that a burden exist in searching all of the claims. While the Examiner contends that the aziridine compositions can be made by other processes, she has not identified what these processes are by way of example such as an article or a textbook reference. Likewise, the Examiner has provided no examples of Applicants compositions having other uses. Therefore since the Examiner has not met the burden of showing that the various groups are distinct, the restriction is considered improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, the M.P.E.P. in Section 803 states as follows:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without a serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Applicants respectfully submit that a search of all of the claims would not impose a serious burden on the Office.

Applicants respectfully request that, should the compositions of the elected invention be found allowable, that the Examiner rejoin at least the method claims of Group II in accordance with the rejoinder procedures of M.P.E.P. § 821.04.

Accordingly and for the reasons presented above Applicants submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.


Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits an early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)


Daniel R. Evans, Ph.D.
Registration No. 55,868